

Remarks

Claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-18. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended herein. Claim 19 has been cancelled herein. No new matter has been introduced as a result of these claim amendments.

Claim Rejections35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for identification of the particular term(s) that render Claim 1 indefinite. Claim 1 has been amended to correct the grammatical error found on lines 12-14.

35 U.S.C §103

Claims 1-4, 11-13, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernard, U.S. Patent No. 5,497,339, hereafter referred to as Bernard, in view of Sitaraman, U.S. Patent No. 6,466,977, hereafter referred to as Sitaraman.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to include the limitation of " closing said port in response to detecting operational variations that are unfamiliar to said LAN." Applicants have reviewed the cited references and assert that Bernard in

combination with Sitaraman fails to teach or suggest this limitation. Applicants agree with the Examiner that Bernard fails to teach authenticating a user, as claimed in amended Claims 1 and 11. However, Applicants respectfully assert that Sitaraman remedies the deficiencies of Bernard. In particular, neither Bernard nor Sitaraman teach or suggest monitoring a connection for unfamiliar activity and closing a port in response to detection of unfamiliar activity, as claimed.

Sitaraman may purport to teach a scheme for authentication, however, Sitaraman fails to teach or suggest "closing said port in response to detecting operational variations that are unfamiliar to said LAN," as claimed in amended independent Claims 1 and 11. Applicants understand Sitaraman to teach a system for routing AAA requests to the correct proxy service. Sitaraman fails to teach or suggest active monitoring of the connection and a security scheme to disconnect devices that are performing actions unfamiliar to the network, as claimed. In fact, Sitaraman merely routes the AAA requests to the correct proxy server and then is finished with the request. Sitaraman fails to monitor the connection after the request has been forwarded to another party.

For this rational, Claims 1-4, 11-13 are patentable over the combination of Bernard and Sitaraman. As such, Applicants respectfully request allowance of these claims.

Claims 5-9 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernard in view of Sitaraman and further in view of Kimball et al., (5,859,959), hereafter referred to as Kimball. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

For the rational presented above, Bernard-Sitaraman fails to teach or suggest "closing said port in response to detecting operational variations that are unfamiliar to said LAN," as claimed. Kimball fails to teach or suggest this limitation. Kimball purports to teach preservation of a network connection by providing a dual-connection option. This actually teaches away from "closing said port in response to detecting operational variations that are unfamiliar to said LAN," as claimed because providing redundant connections would require monitoring twice the number of connections. This would essentially double the workload of the present invention. As such, Claims 5-9 and 14-17 are patentable over Bernard-Sitaraman in view of Kimball. Applicants respectfully request allowance of these claims.

Claims 10 and 18 are rejected over Bernard-Sitaraman in view of Atkinson (US Pat. App. No. US 2001/0054180 A1), hereafter referred to as Atkinson. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

For the rational presented above, Bernard-Sitaraman fails to teach or suggest "closing said port in response to detecting operational variations that are unfamiliar to said LAN," as claimed. Atkinson fails to teach or suggest this limitation. Atkinson purports to teach a system and method for synchronizing output of media in public spaces. However, Atkinson fails to teach or suggest any type of authentication at all. In fact, Atkinson teaches away from the present invention by providing a communication link without authentication (by way of a public broadcast). Atkinson broadcast media to multiple devices at one time via multiple unauthenticated communication links. For this rational, Claim 10 is patentable over Bernard-Sitaraman in view of Atkinson. As such, allowance of Claim 10 is earnestly solicited. Claim 18 has been cancelled herein.

CONCLUSION


In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the Claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-18 overcome the rejections and objections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-18 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 4/19, 2004⁵



Anthony Murabito
Registration No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060